



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,093	09/12/2003	Jeffrey D. Gilbert	42P17020	8868

8791 7590 11/16/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

CHERY, MARDOCHEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2188

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/662,093	Applicant(s) GILBERT ET AL.	
	Examiner Mardochee Chery	Art Unit 2188	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 9/12/03 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance of the Foreign Patent Document (WO 00/52582; Fujitsu Siemens Computers GMBH; 09-08-2000), as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 11, 14, 18, 21, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims recite an inner relationship associating a second cache to a first cache. However, the phrase "inner relationship" was not describe in the specification as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Arimilli (6,629,268).

As per claim 1, Arimilli (6,629,268) discloses an apparatus, comprising: a first interface [Fig.2; Bus Interface Unit 35]; a second interface not directly coupled to said first interface [Fig.2; Interface 18]; and a cache accessible from said first interface and said second interface, to contain a cache line with a first cache coherency state when accessed from said first interface and a second cache coherency state when accessed from said second interface [Fig.2; L2 cache, Bus Interface 35, Interface 19; col.8, lines 6-33].

As per claim 31, the rationale in the rejection of claim 1 is herein incorporated. Arimilli (268) further discloses a bus bridge to a third interface [Fig.1]; and an input-output device coupled to a third interface [Fig.3].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-10 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arimilli (6,629,268) in view of Arimilli (2002/0129211).

As per claim 2, Arimilli (268) discloses the claimed invention as discussed above in the previous paragraphs. However, Arimilli (268) does not specifically teach the first cache coherency state has higher privilege than said second cache coherency state when said second interface is coupled to a processor as required by the claims.

Arimilli (2002/0129211) discloses the first cache coherency state has higher privilege than said second cache coherency state when said second interface is coupled to a processor [par. 10] to resolve conflicts between requests to modify a cache line (par. 2).

Since the technology for implementing a cache system with the first cache coherency state has higher privilege than said second cache coherency state when said second interface is coupled to a processor was well known as evidenced by Arimilli (211), an artisan would have been motivated to implement this feature in the system of Arimilli (268) in order to resolve conflicts between requests to modify a cache line. Thus,

Art Unit: 2188

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant to modify the system of Armilli (268) to include the first cache coherency state has higher privilege than said second cache coherency state when said second interface is coupled to a processor because this would have resolved conflicts between requests to modify a cache line (par. 2).

As per claim 3, Arimilli (211) discloses a second cache coherency state is to reduce snoop transactions on said second interface [par. 5].

As per claim 4, Arimilli (211) discloses said first cache coherency state is exclusive and said second cache coherency state is shared [pars. 6, 24 and 36].

As per claim 5, Arimilli (211) discloses first cache coherency state is modified and said second cache coherency state is shared [par. 8].

As per claim 6, Arimilli (211) discloses second cache coherency state supports speculative invalidation [par. 6].

As per claim 7, Arimilli (211) discloses first cache coherency state is modified and said second cache coherency state is invalid [par. 7].

As per claim 8, Arimilli (211) discloses first cache coherency state is exclusive

Art Unit: 2188

and said second cache coherency state is invalid [pars. 6 and 36].

As per claim 9, Arimilli (211) discloses the first cache coherency state is shared and said second cache coherency state is invalid [par. 7].

As per claim 10, Arimilli (211) discloses the second cache coherency state further supports explicit invalidation [pars. 7 and 10].

As per claim 32, the rationale in the rejection of claim 2 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 33, the rationale in the rejection of claim 3 is herein incorporated.

8. Claims 11-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arimilli (2002/0129211) in view of Arimilli (6,341,336).

As per claim 11, Arimilli (211) discloses a method, comprising: associating a first cache coherency state with a first cache line in a first cache [par. 10]; associating a second cache coherency state with a second cache line in a second cache in an inner relationship to said first cache [pars. 24 and 29];

However, Arimilli (211) does not specifically teach transitioning a first cache coherency state to a joint cache coherency state including a first cache coherency state for outer interfaces and a third cache coherency state for inner interfaces; and

Art Unit: 2188

transitioning a second cache coherency state to a third cache coherency state as required by the claim.

Arimilli (336) discloses transitioning a first cache coherency state to a joint cache coherency state including a first cache coherency state for outer interfaces and a third cache coherency state for inner interfaces [col.4, lines 60 to col.5, lines 15]; and transitioning a second cache coherency state to a third cache coherency state [col.5, lines 47 to col.6, lines 4] to allow modified data to move from cache to cache without affecting memory while allowing the data to be shared (col.5, lines 16-34).

Since the technology for implementing a cache system with transitioning a first cache coherency state to a joint cache coherency state including a first cache coherency state for outer interfaces and a third cache coherency state for inner interfaces was well known as evidenced by Arimilli (336), an artisan would have been motivated to implement this feature in the system Arimilli (211) since this would have allowed modified data to be moved from cache to cache without affecting memory while allowing the data to be shared. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by Applicant to modify the system of Arimilli (211) to include transitioning a first cache coherency state to a joint cache coherency state including a first cache coherency state for outer interfaces and a third cache coherency state for inner interfaces in order to allow modified data to be moved from cache to cache without affecting memory while allowing the data to be shared (col.5, lines 16-34) as taught by Arimilli (336).

As per claim 12, Arimilli (336) discloses a first cache coherency state is exclusive, a second cache coherency state is invalid, and a third cache coherency state is shared [col.4, lines 60 to col.5, lines 15].

As per claim 13, Arimilli (336) discloses a first cache coherency state is modified, said second cache coherency state is modified, and said third cache coherency state is invalid [col.4, lines 60 to col.5, lines 15].

As per claim 14, the rationale in the rejection of claim 11 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 15, Arimilli (211) discloses the first cache coherency state is modified [par. 36].

As per claim 16, Arimilli (211) discloses the first cache coherency state is exclusive [par. 36].

As per claim 17, Arimilli (211) discloses the first cache coherency state is shared [par. 37].

As per claim 18, the rationale in the rejection of claim 11 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 19, Arimilli (336) discloses the first cache coherency state is invalid

Art Unit: 2188

and the joint cache coherency state is exclusive-shared [col.4, lines 16-40].

As per claim 20, Arimilli (336) discloses the first cache coherency state is modified-invalid and the joint cache coherency state is modified-shared [col.4, lines 60 to col.5, lines 15; col.7, line 66 to col.8, line 9].

As per claim 21, the rationale in the rejection of claim 11 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 22, the rationale in the rejection of claim 12 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 23, the rationale in the rejection of claim 13 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 24, the rationale in the rejection of claim 14 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 25, the rationale in the rejection of claim 15 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 26, the rationale in the rejection of claim 16 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 27, the rationale in the rejection of claim 17 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 28, the rationale in the rejection of claim 18 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 29, the rationale in the rejection of claim 19 is herein incorporated.

As per claim 30, the rationale in the rejection of claim 20 is herein incorporated.

Conclusion

9. When responding to the office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty that he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mardochee Chery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4246. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30A-5:00P.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manonama Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-4210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2188

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 7, 2005



Mardochee Chery
Examiner
AU: 2188

Kevin L. Ellis
Primary Examiner

